

Management Plan for a State Matching Grant Program for Elderly
and Disabled Demand Responsive Transportation

Enacted in C.G.S. 13b-38bb

State Fiscal Year 2013 Program

State of Connecticut
Department of Transportation
Bureau of Public Transportation

Table of Contents

Program Description	1
Program Goals	2
Roles and Responsibilities	2
Eligible Projects and Expenses	3
Transportation Services for Seniors and People with Disabilities.....	3
Regional Coordinated Services	3
Administration Costs	4
Ineligible Projects and Expenses	4
Capital Equipment	4
General Public Transportation and School Transportation.....	5
Eligible Recipients/Applicants.....	5
Eligible Match.....	5
Municipal Funding Cuts	6
Project Selection Criteria and Method of Distributing Funds	6
Local Coordination Plan	7
Quarterly Reporting	7
Annual Reporting.....	8
Financial Reporting (Maintenance of Effort)	8
Application Checklist.....	8
SFY 2013 Grant Application Process and Timetable	9
 Appendix A – Table of Available Allocations by Town	 10
 Appendix B - Coordination Models	 14
 Appendix C – Quarterly Reporting Form	 16
 Appendix D – Connecticut General Statutes 13b-38bb	 17
 Appendix E – Sample Application	 18
 Attachment 1 – Maintenance of Effort Certification	
 Attachment 2 – Grant Assignment Certification	

Program Description

A review of “Elderly Transportation Services” by the Legislative Program Review and Investigations Committee in 1998 highlighted the inconsistent availability of transportation across the state for seniors and people with disabilities. The program review committee found that:

- programs vary greatly among municipalities, with the level of service provided dependent on geographic lines, available funding, and local support;
- funding sources differ substantially depending on the municipality;
- no single funding source exists, instead funding is a patchwork of federal, state and local money;
- a local grant program would equalize funding among towns that already have dial-a-ride programs and provide opportunities for dial-ride services in towns where they are not currently available.

The Connecticut General Assembly enacted the recommended grant program in the 1999 legislative session, but funding was not appropriated until State Fiscal Year (SFY) 2006.

The senior and disabled transportation municipal grant program (hereinafter referred to as the “Municipal Grant Program”) has made \$5 million available to municipalities annually. The funds are available to any municipality and are apportioned based on the formula in the Connecticut General Statutes (C.G.S.) 13b-38bb, which states:

“Fifty per cent of such funds shall be apportioned on the basis of the share of population of persons age sixty or older in the municipality relative to the state’s total population of persons age sixty or older, as defined in the most recent federal decennial census or in estimates provided in the five-year interim by the Office of Policy and Management. Fifty percent of such funds shall be apportioned on the basis of a municipality’s square mileage relative to the state’s total square mileage.”

C.G.S. 13b-38bb also requires that municipalities apply to the state for the funds through a designated Regional Planning Organization (RPO) or transit district. The applicant must work with this regional body to determine how to use the funding most effectively in that municipality and its surrounding region. If a municipality chooses not to apply for its share, that portion will be returned to the Special Transportation Fund.

In order to be certain that state funds will not be used to supplant municipal funds, the municipality must certify their maintenance of effort annually. Grants require a local match so that the grant funds do not exceed 50% of total dial-a-ride expenditures. If a municipality is already providing transportation for seniors and person with disabilities, those funds can be used towards the matching requirement, with some restrictions. Please see the “Eligible Match” section for details.

Program Goals

- provide a uniform funding source available to all municipalities in the state,
- provide new transportation services to enhance access to the community for seniors and people with disabilities where transportation services do not exist,
- expand transportation services to enhance access to the community in areas where transportation is already available,
- encourage efficient use of scarce resources through coordination.

Roles and Responsibilities

Role of the state:

- Determine allocations for each municipality
- Prepare application package and distribute to RPOs
- Provide application and coordination assistance
- Review applications submitted by municipalities through RPOs
- Announce Awards
- Prepare and execute agreements/addenda with grantees
- Make payments in accordance with guidelines
- Collect data on program performance
- Provide data on program performance upon request
- Update and revise program guidance and documents as needed

Role of the municipality:

- Develop a program to provide transportation services to seniors and people with disabilities that meets the intent of the statutes, and complies with the program requirements
- Consider coordinating efforts
- Prepare application to RPO/Connecticut Department of Transportation (ConnDOT)
- Document matching funds
- Certify maintenance of effort
- When applicable, certify grant assignment
- Execute an agreement/addendum with ConnDOT or a coordinating entity
- Submit invoices for payment in accordance with guidelines (if appropriate)
- Provide or contract for transportation services (when appropriate) based on the municipality's own purchasing policies.
- Collect and submit data on transportation provided (if appropriate)

Role of the RPO:

- Distribute application packages to municipalities
- Provide application and coordination review and assistance
- Submit applications to State including report on responsiveness of municipalities to coordination efforts

Role of the coordinating entity (if applicable):

- Develop a program to provide transportation services to seniors and people with disabilities that meets the intent of the statutes, and complies with the program requirements
- Prepare application to RPO/ConnDOT
- Execute an agreement/addendum with ConnDOT
- Submit invoices for payment in accordance with guidelines (if appropriate)
- Provide or contract for transportation services
- Collect and submit data on transportation provided

Eligible Projects and Expenses

Transportation Services for Seniors and People with Disabilities

Projects funded by the Municipal Grant Program must serve both seniors and people with disabilities. Services that are open to the general public will not be funded, but may be coordinated with services funded by the Municipal Grant Program. While ConnDOT is not requiring that every vehicle used in this program be wheelchair accessible, the overall transportation program provided using these funds must be accessible.

ConnDOT does not require that a fare be charged for the services provided using the municipal dial-a-ride grant funds. However, if a fare is collected, it must be reported and used to offset operating costs related to the municipality's dial-a-ride program.

If the applicant is a Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5310 grant program recipient who intends to expand the services provided with their vehicle to include a new client group, they must amend the program description submitted with their original Section 5310 grant application by providing a written description of those changes to the Section 5310 program manager at ConnDOT.

Regional Coordinated Services

In order to enhance coordination efforts and maximize existing resources, the Department has expanded the eligible services category to include a regional coordinated service which allows towns to regionalize their funds through a coordinating agency. A regional coordinated transportation program would allow access by an eligible resident (i.e. Seniors or People with Disabilities) of any member town to any other member town (or destinations outside the region as determined by the involved municipalities). The involved municipalities must mutually agree to put 100% of their MGP allocation into the regional program, even though the value of the amount of service provided may be more or less than their MGP funds.

While this does not exactly fulfill the intent of the grant program that each town receive a formularized level of funding for transportation, it does meet the goal of promoting coordination and creates regional program that can better serve the mobility needs of the residents.

If you have questions on how this might work for your town or region, please contact Lisa Rivers at 860-594-2834 or lisa.rivers@ct.gov.

Administration Costs

Administration costs are allowed under this grant program, but they must be directly attributable to the dial-a-ride operation. Administration costs charged to the grant program may not account for more than 10% of the total grant. (See FAQs for a definition of Administration Costs.)

Ineligible Projects and Expenses

Capital Equipment

Capital equipment purchases, including vehicle purchases, are not an eligible expense. If new, wheelchair accessible equipment is required; the municipality can prepare a grant application to their RPO for FTA Section 5310 program funds, or pursue other local funding programs or resources for vehicle purchases.

The FTA Section 5310 program, administered by ConnDOT, provides funding for vehicle grants. Eligible grant recipients are private nonprofit organizations or eligible public bodies. The vehicles must be used to assist in meeting the transportation needs of elderly persons and persons with disabilities where public transportation services are unavailable, insufficient, or inappropriate.

Section 5310 program grants are federally funded 80% by FTA with 20% funded by the awarded recipient. In the federal fiscal year 2012 program, there is a maximum federal grant of \$40,000 per vehicle. Section 5310 grant recipients must use the funding to purchase new project equipment.

From the time of approval of a Section 5310 grant, it takes approximately 15-18 months for physical delivery of vehicles. Grants are awarded on a competitive basis. The average number of grants awarded over the past five years is approximately 26 per year, statewide.

Should you be interested in obtaining an application for the Section 5310 program or would like more information related to the program, please contact the program manager at 860-594-2912.

General Public Transportation and School Transportation

General public transportation and school transportation are not eligible expenses or match under this grant program.

Eligible Recipients/Applicants

Municipalities are eligible to receive a grant from ConnDOT for their annual allocation from the appropriated funds. If an RPO or transit district submits a coordinated regional application, the funds for the coordinating municipalities will be granted to the coordinating entity. In this case, the municipality must certify that they are assigning their grant apportionment to the coordinating entity.

Eligible Match

Funds provided to match the municipal grants must serve the same population as the municipal grant funds, that is, funding spent on general public transportation, school transportation, etc., will not be considered match. However, funds spent to serve either seniors or people with disabilities will be allowed as match, as long as the expanded services are available to both populations.

Matching funds can include operating costs for the current system, eligible and reasonable in-kind services, maintenance costs, and vehicle lease costs. Examples of in-kind services include volunteer services directly related to the transportation program, and donated supplies, loaned equipment or space. If the municipality does not have a transportation program, letters of commitment from all sources of matching funds must be provided with the application.

Capital expenditures to purchase vehicles, general public transportation, and school transportation are not eligible for match, or as eligible project expenses.

Municipalities can match the Municipal Grant Program funds with local funds, and State or Federal agency funds, but may not use other Connecticut Department of Transportation or U.S. Department of Transportation funding as match.

A 50% match is required. This means that matching dollars must be *at least equal* to the amount of grant funds. Municipalities must each provide their own match to the State grant funds and submit appropriate documentation. Program match cannot be regionalized; i.e. one municipality cannot provide overmatch to offset another municipality's shortfall in matching funds.

Administrative costs such as direct salary or other costs directly attributable to the delivery of the transportation services will be allowed as eligible program costs and can be used as match. Administrative costs may not account for more than 10% of the total grant.

In order to document the available and claimed matching funds, the applicant must submit municipal budget documents showing budget requests for transportation services for SFY 2013. The transportation funding must be for services and expenditures that have been determined eligible based on the requirements in the “Eligible Match” section.

Municipal Funding Cuts

If a municipality reduces their transportation budget, the Department would reduce the municipal grant funds available to the town by a percentage equal to the percentage reduction of municipal funds. For example, if a town budget for dial-a-ride (DAR) was \$20,000 in SFY 2012, but is reduced \$2,000 in SFY 2013, the municipal grant award would be reduced by 10%.

Also, the reduced funding level would not become the new baseline match for future years. In the example above, the baseline maintenance of effort for the SFY 2012 application would not become \$18,000, but would continue to be \$20,000. The MGP grant would not be restored in full until the municipality restores their transportation budget. If municipal transportation funds are restored incrementally in future years, MGP funds would increase accordingly.

State Funding Cuts

The available allocations (see Appendix A) to the municipalities have been changed due to updated population figures from the 2010 Census. A 2013 application should be based on these figures, not the prior census. The Department’s budget for this program requires that awards be reduced by 25% again this year. In spite of this, please prepare your application as if funding was not reduced. The Department will adjust the awards to reflect the available budget.

Project Selection Criteria and Method of Distributing Funds

The basic project selection criteria for the Municipal Grant Program consist of the following:

- Assurances that both seniors and persons with disabilities will receive transportation services.
- Timely, accurate, documented financial and statistical reporting from the prior service year(s), as required.
- Availability of appropriate matching funds and supporting documents for maintenance of effort.

- Collaboration on service design with the designated regional application body.

While coordination of services can be an effective use of resources, it may not always be the least expensive method. The municipality must work with the regional body to determine what service delivery method will work best for the municipality and the region.

If an RPO determines that a municipality should be part of a coordinated transportation model and the municipality chooses to not participate, the municipality can still apply for, and, if approved, receive their full grant apportionment. However, those municipalities that choose to not coordinate even though the RPO recommends coordination, will receive no points for coordination when applying for a Section 5310 vehicle grant.

If an application is rejected or deemed insufficient, the applicant must submit updated information for review and approval before an agreement will be prepared by ConnDOT. ConnDOT will not provide a retroactive contract start date if any delays caused by the required resubmission push the agreement approval date beyond July 1.

Local Coordination Plan

C.G.S. 13b-38bb requires coordination efforts, stating that “The regional planning organization or transit district and municipalities interested in applying for the funds shall collaborate on service design to determine how to use the funding most effectively in that municipality and its surrounding region. The commissioner shall have the authority to approve or disapprove the method for delivery of service.” Applicants must describe how they intend to meet the needs of seniors and people with disabilities. They must also indicate how they intend to coordinate resources or why they will not coordinate. The RPO must indicate whether each municipality applying for funding was willing to coordinate.

Quarterly Reporting

C.G.S Section 13b-38bb (f) states, “A municipality, receiving a grant provided pursuant to this section, shall annually submit to the Commissioner of Transportation, on forms provided by said commissioner, the following data on such transportation programs: (1) the number of unduplicated riders; (2) the number of one-way trips; (3) the number of miles traveled; (4) the number of trip denials; (5) the number of hours vehicles are in use annually; (6) all federal, state, municipal and other revenues received and expenditures incurred in the provision of dial-a-ride services; and (7) any other information determined to be necessary by the commissioner.”

ConnDOT requires quarterly reporting of statistical information. (See Appendix C)

Quarterly reporting can be sent via mail, fax or e-mail to:

Aimee Marques

Transportation Planner 2

Connecticut Department of Transportation

P.O. Box 317546

Newington, CT 06131-7546

Fax 860-594-2848

e-mail: aimee.marques@ct.gov

Phone 860-594-2840

Annual Reporting

If the municipality has a transportation program in place that the municipality proposes to use as match to the Municipal Grant Program, annual revenue and expense reporting for SFY 2010 and SFY 2011 are required with this grant application. These must consist of “Actuals” for SFY 2010 and “Budgeted” and “Actuals-to-Date” for SFY 2011.

Financial Reporting (Maintenance of Effort-MOE)

C.G.S. Section 13b-38bb (g) states, “*A municipality receiving a grant pursuant to this section shall annually submit to the Commissioner of Transportation a certification that any state grant shall be in addition to current municipality levels of spending on such programs.*”

Each municipality applying for funds must submit an annual certification that the Municipal Grant Program funds are in addition to current municipal levels of spending on transportation programs for seniors and persons with disabilities. If there have been no cuts to funding used to match the Municipal Grant Program, the chief fiscal officer for the municipality must sign version A of the Maintenance of Effort. If there is a reduction in local funding, the chief fiscal officer must sign version B of the Maintenance of Effort acknowledging that state funds will be reduced in accordance with the local funding.

ConnDOT will fund the Municipal Grant Program to the level of apportionment but must be assured that all funds will be spent on the target program. If all of the funds are not spent in the current grant fiscal year, those funds must be returned to ConnDOT or the municipality should reduce their funding request for the following year. Municipalities will no longer be allowed to use carry over funding to expand services above the annual apportionment.

Application Checklist

1. Completed application
2. **Annual certification** that the Municipal Grant Program funds are in addition to current municipal levels of spending or that there has been a reduction to spending on

transportation programs for seniors and persons with disabilities. The chief fiscal officer for the municipality must sign this document.

3. **Municipal budget documents** showing budget requests for transportation services for SFY 2012 and/or letters of commitment from other sources of matching funds. The transportation funding must be for services and expenditures that have been determined eligible based on the requirements in the “Eligible Projects and Expenses” and “Eligible Match” sections.
4. If a coordinating entity is submitting the application, each municipality included in the application must certify that they are assigning their grant apportionment to the coordinating entity.

SFY 2012 Grant Application Process and Timetable

1.	ConnDOT forwards application package to RPOs for distribution to municipalities.	February 1, 2012
2.	The RPO collaborates with municipalities on potential for coordination.	
3.	Municipalities submit applications to the RPO.	April 2, 2012
4.	RPO submits applications to ConnDOT with any additional information on accuracy of application and coordination efforts.	April 16, 2012
5.	ConnDOT reviews applications, announces awards (via e-mail). Applications that are not approved must be resubmitted with updated information. ¹	June 11, 2012
6.	ConnDOT prepares agreements or Transit Operating Documents (TOD) for signature.	June 11, 2012
7.	Once a TOD is in signed, the municipality can submit a request for payment.	July 16, 2012
8.	Grantees provide quarterly reporting to ConnDOT.	See schedule in reporting section

¹ If an application is rejected or deemed insufficient, the applicant must submit updated information for review and approval before an agreement will be prepared by ConnDOT. ConnDOT will not provide a retroactive contract start date if any delays caused by the required resubmission push the agreement approval date beyond July 1.

ConnDOT-Connecticut Department of Transportation

RPO-Regional Planning Organization

TOD-Transit Operating Document (replaces addendum)

Appendix A

Allocation by Municipality of Funding for the Municipal Dial-a-Ride Program for Seniors and People with Disabilities SFY 2013 Program Year - based on 2010 Census

Municipality	Total Percent						Percent						Total
	60-64	65-69	70-74	75-79	80-84	over 85	over 60 of Total	Allocation	Sq. Miles	Sq. Miles	Allocation	Apportionment	
Andover	206	120	81	47	43	47	544	0.077%	\$1,916	15.6	0.311%	\$7,779	\$9,694
Ansonia	1001	762	546	443	422	419	3,593	0.506%	\$12,654	6.2	0.124%	\$3,091	\$15,745
Ashford	260	177	116	70	59	57	739	0.104%	\$2,603	40.3	0.804%	\$20,095	\$22,697
Avon	1250	806	644	537	465	547	4,249	0.599%	\$14,964	23.5	0.469%	\$11,718	\$26,682
Barkhamsted	273	197	128	90	52	51	791	0.111%	\$2,786	39	0.778%	\$19,446	\$22,232
Beacon Falls	394	314	179	122	80	88	1,177	0.166%	\$4,145	9.8	0.195%	\$4,887	\$9,032
Berlin	1362	960	684	636	625	569	4,836	0.681%	\$17,032	27	0.539%	\$13,463	\$30,495
Bethany	353	266	161	131	128	97	1,136	0.160%	\$4,001	21.6	0.431%	\$10,770	\$14,771
Bethel	1096	769	476	426	339	357	3,463	0.488%	\$12,196	17	0.339%	\$8,477	\$20,673
Bethlehem	315	197	108	94	77	63	854	0.120%	\$3,008	19.7	0.393%	\$9,823	\$12,831
Bloomfield	1584	1197	968	825	787	972	6,333	0.892%	\$22,304	26.4	0.527%	\$13,164	\$35,468
Bolton	342	257	184	114	104	68	1,069	0.151%	\$3,765	15.5	0.309%	\$7,729	\$11,494
Bozrah	160	142	75	73	53	52	555	0.078%	\$1,955	20	0.399%	\$9,972	\$11,927
Branford	2123	1570	1070	905	865	977	7,510	1.058%	\$26,449	27.9	0.556%	\$13,912	\$40,361
Bridgeport	6068	4382	3192	2528	2124	2262	20,556	2.896%	\$72,395	17.5	0.349%	\$8,726	\$81,121
Bridgewater	174	157	92	68	57	42	590	0.083%	\$2,078	16.3	0.325%	\$8,128	\$10,205
Bristol	3414	2483	1810	1661	1438	1634	12,440	1.752%	\$43,812	27	0.539%	\$13,463	\$57,275
Brookfield	1006	799	515	375	335	297	3,327	0.469%	\$11,717	19.8	0.395%	\$9,873	\$21,590
Brooklyn	428	350	290	195	137	209	1,609	0.227%	\$5,667	28.7	0.572%	\$14,311	\$19,977
Burlington	593	426	189	156	98	88	1,550	0.218%	\$5,459	30.6	0.610%	\$15,258	\$20,717
Canaan	94	59	59	39	43	101	395	0.056%	\$1,391	33.4	0.666%	\$16,654	\$18,045
Canterbury	380	238	129	97	69	56	969	0.137%	\$3,413	40	0.798%	\$19,945	\$23,358
Canton	702	526	335	261	215	232	2,271	0.320%	\$7,998	25	0.499%	\$12,466	\$20,464
Chaplin	129	102	83	45	38	33	430	0.061%	\$1,514	19.8	0.395%	\$9,873	\$11,387
Cheshire	1844	1200	748	667	680	807	5,946	0.838%	\$20,941	33	0.658%	\$16,455	\$37,396
Chester	316	222	113	89	162	243	1,145	0.161%	\$4,033	15.9	0.317%	\$7,928	\$11,961
Clinton	975	720	473	332	244	244	2,988	0.421%	\$10,523	17.2	0.343%	\$8,576	\$19,100
Colchester	840	574	359	289	220	284	2,566	0.361%	\$9,037	48.7	0.971%	\$24,283	\$33,320
Colebrook	105	80	51	39	26	29	330	0.046%	\$1,162	33	0.658%	\$16,455	\$17,617
Columbia	404	300	199	130	109	101	1,243	0.175%	\$4,378	21.8	0.435%	\$10,870	\$15,248
Cornwall	127	86	71	58	45	37	424	0.060%	\$1,493	46.8	0.933%	\$23,336	\$24,829
Coventry	776	537	292	198	161	141	2,105	0.297%	\$7,413	37.3	0.744%	\$18,599	\$26,012
Cromwell	910	571	379	396	390	548	3,194	0.450%	\$11,249	13.5	0.269%	\$6,731	\$17,980
Danbury	3882	2701	1893	1579	1329	1476	12,860	1.812%	\$45,291	44	0.878%	\$21,939	\$67,230
Darien	899	771	481	388	373	365	3,277	0.462%	\$11,541	14.9	0.297%	\$7,429	\$18,971

Appendix A

Municipality	Total Percent						Percent				Total	
	60-64	65-69	70-74	75-79	80-84	over 85	over 60 of Total	Allocation	Sq. Miles	Sq. Miles Allocation	Appportionment	
Deep River	350	236	138	126	88	97	1,035	0.146%	\$3,645	14.2	0.283%	\$10,726
Derby	728	549	420	354	305	387	2,743	0.386%	\$9,660	5.3	0.106%	\$12,303
Durham	456	353	191	151	133	115	1,399	0.197%	\$4,927	23.3	0.465%	\$16,545
East Granby	314	237	193	135	77	86	1,042	0.147%	\$3,670	17.4	0.347%	\$12,346
East Haddam	645	444	265	186	132	159	1,831	0.258%	\$6,449	57.6	1.149%	\$35,169
East Hampton	871	557	372	248	192	178	2,418	0.341%	\$8,516	36.8	0.734%	\$26,865
East Hartford	2674	2041	1566	1275	1086	1077	9,719	1.369%	\$34,229	18.7	0.373%	\$43,553
East Haven	1796	1336	950	948	829	1073	6,932	0.977%	\$24,413	12.6	0.251%	\$30,696
East Lyme	1209	1077	779	547	482	459	4,553	0.641%	\$16,035	34.8	0.694%	\$33,387
East Windsor	674	538	416	310	266	219	2,423	0.341%	\$8,533	26.8	0.535%	\$21,897
Eastford	150	77	56	37	38	28	386	0.054%	\$1,359	28.6	0.570%	\$15,620
Easton	470	363	239	204	153	171	1,600	0.225%	\$5,635	28.8	0.574%	\$19,995
Ellington	918	693	392	313	232	198	2,746	0.387%	\$9,671	34.8	0.694%	\$27,023
Enfield	2216	1920	1453	1417	1038	935	8,979	1.265%	\$31,623	33.8	0.674%	\$48,476
Essex	546	427	288	252	210	300	2,023	0.285%	\$7,125	12.2	0.243%	\$13,208
Fairfield	3005	2374	1638	1553	1477	1878	11,925	1.680%	\$41,998	30.6	0.610%	\$57,256
Farmington	1643	1170	811	781	703	869	5,977	0.842%	\$21,050	28.7	0.572%	\$35,361
Franklin	124	112	70	50	27	29	412	0.058%	\$1,451	20	0.399%	\$11,423
Glastonbury	2189	1512	1058	783	767	818	7,127	1.004%	\$25,100	52.5	1.047%	\$51,278
Goshen	275	177	123	93	68	56	792	0.112%	\$2,789	45.6	0.909%	\$25,527
Granby	746	475	360	284	232	188	2,285	0.322%	\$8,047	41.3	0.824%	\$28,641
Greenwich	3468	2794	2173	1819	1540	1742	13,536	1.907%	\$47,672	50.6	1.009%	\$72,902
Griswold	669	457	246	253	174	146	1,945	0.274%	\$6,850	37.6	0.750%	\$25,598
Groton	1943	1522	1077	969	829	930	7,270	1.024%	\$25,604	38.3	0.764%	\$44,701
Guilford	1840	1384	817	665	493	554	5,753	0.810%	\$20,261	47.7	0.951%	\$44,046
Haddam	585	466	275	152	125	136	1,739	0.245%	\$6,124	46.7	0.931%	\$29,410
Hamden	3309	2207	1765	1645	1541	2013	12,480	1.758%	\$43,953	33	0.658%	\$60,407
Hampton	162	95	52	43	34	35	421	0.059%	\$1,483	25.3	0.505%	\$14,098
Hartford	5256	3646	2655	1983	1391	1428	16,359	2.305%	\$57,614	18.4	0.367%	\$66,789
Hartland	146	118	43	59	30	36	432	0.061%	\$1,521	34.5	0.688%	\$18,724
Harwinton	439	328	187	145	124	122	1,345	0.189%	\$4,737	31.4	0.626%	\$20,394
Hebron	620	368	232	138	89	106	1,553	0.219%	\$5,469	37.5	0.748%	\$24,168
Kent	248	174	156	108	99	96	881	0.124%	\$3,103	49.5	0.987%	\$27,785
Killingly	967	683	563	437	332	402	3,384	0.477%	\$11,918	50	0.997%	\$36,849
Killingworth	570	384	255	170	146	91	1,616	0.228%	\$5,691	36	0.718%	\$23,642

Appendix A

Municipality	Total Percent						Percent				Total	
	60-64	65-69	70-74	75-79	80-84	over 85	over 60 of Total	Allocation	Sq. Miles	Sq. Miles Allocation	Apportionment	
Lebanon	475	315	180	151	103	89	1,313 0.185%	\$4,624	56.1	1.119%	\$27,973	\$32,597
Ledyard	910	689	454	326	266	185	2,830 0.399%	\$9,967	40.5	0.808%	\$20,194	\$30,161
Lisbon	280	219	132	100	73	90	894 0.126%	\$3,149	16.5	0.329%	\$8,227	\$11,376
Litchfield	676	521	353	275	228	281	2,334 0.329%	\$8,220	57.3	1.143%	\$28,571	\$36,791
Lyme	237	190	120	91	95	72	805 0.113%	\$2,835	33	0.658%	\$16,455	\$19,290
Madison	1366	1008	732	591	507	480	4,684 0.660%	\$16,496	36.3	0.724%	\$18,100	\$34,596
Manchester	3248	2257	1544	1201	1170	1455	10,875 1.532%	\$38,300	27.2	0.543%	\$13,563	\$51,863
Mansfield	754	605	411	349	323	344	2,786 0.392%	\$9,812	45.2	0.902%	\$22,538	\$32,350
Marlborough	475	319	151	121	83	119	1,268 0.179%	\$4,466	23.5	0.469%	\$11,718	\$16,183
Meriden	3305	2235	1593	1430	1195	1381	11,139 1.569%	\$39,230	24	0.479%	\$11,967	\$51,197
Middlebury	502	408	272	212	201	209	1,804 0.254%	\$6,353	18	0.359%	\$8,975	\$15,329
Middlefield	274	207	145	145	119	91	981 0.138%	\$3,455	13.3	0.265%	\$6,632	\$10,087
Middletown	2415	1798	1315	1056	989	1127	8,700 1.226%	\$30,640	42.9	0.856%	\$21,391	\$52,031
Milford	3494	2644	1726	1517	1336	1362	12,079 1.702%	\$42,540	23.5	0.469%	\$11,718	\$54,258
Monroe	1143	782	619	489	390	319	3,742 0.527%	\$13,179	26.4	0.527%	\$13,164	\$26,342
Montville	1086	855	611	521	370	308	3,751 0.528%	\$13,210	43.9	0.876%	\$21,890	\$35,100
Morris	178	132	74	51	68	46	549 0.077%	\$1,933	18.8	0.375%	\$9,374	\$11,308
Naugatuck	1729	1191	813	619	543	640	5,535 0.780%	\$19,493	16.2	0.323%	\$8,078	\$27,571
New Britain	3260	2175	1622	1469	1577	1889	11,992 1.689%	\$42,234	13.3	0.265%	\$6,632	\$48,866
New Canaan	1126	813	574	516	457	427	3,913 0.551%	\$13,781	23.3	0.465%	\$11,618	\$25,399
New Fairfield	811	614	417	272	199	155	2,468 0.348%	\$8,692	25.3	0.505%	\$12,615	\$21,307
New Hartford	521	333	213	134	104	87	1,392 0.196%	\$4,902	38.3	0.764%	\$19,097	\$24,000
New Haven	5072	3737	2709	2040	1716	1794	17,068 2.404%	\$60,111	21.1	0.421%	\$10,521	\$70,632
New London	1230	816	571	466	435	476	3,994 0.563%	\$14,066	7.3	0.146%	\$3,640	\$17,706
New Milford	1666	1152	777	560	469	469	5,093 0.717%	\$17,937	64.4	1.284%	\$32,111	\$50,048
Newington	2018	1540	1166	964	939	1028	7,655 1.078%	\$26,960	13.2	0.263%	\$6,582	\$33,542
Newtown	1492	1143	770	638	507	451	5,001 0.705%	\$17,613	60.4	1.205%	\$30,117	\$47,730
Norfolk	126	109	72	58	40	36	441 0.062%	\$1,553	46.7	0.931%	\$23,286	\$24,839
North Branford	970	725	550	405	399	443	3,492 0.492%	\$12,298	26.8	0.535%	\$13,363	\$25,661
North Canaan	200	152	132	107	94	142	827 0.117%	\$2,913	19.6	0.391%	\$9,773	\$12,686
North Haven	1600	1252	1064	902	780	794	6,392 0.900%	\$22,512	21	0.419%	\$10,471	\$32,983
North Stonington	371	280	191	143	117	65	1,167 0.164%	\$4,110	56.3	1.123%	\$28,073	\$32,183
Norwalk	4553	3356	2399	2029	1633	1536	15,506 2.184%	\$54,610	27.7	0.552%	\$13,812	\$68,422
Norwich	2238	1505	1073	944	874	901	7,535 1.061%	\$26,537	27.1	0.541%	\$13,513	\$40,050
Old Lyme	623	528	341	336	216	209	2,253 0.317%	\$7,935	27.1	0.541%	\$13,513	\$21,447

Appendix A

Municipality	Total Percent						Percent				Total	
	60-64	65-69	70-74	75-79	80-84	over 85	over 60 of Total	Allocation	Sq. Miles	Sq. Miles Allocation	Apportionment	
Old Saybrook	838	721	557	513	415	388	3,432 0.483%	\$12,087	18.3	0.365%	\$9,125	\$21,212
Orange	924	664	495	527	487	491	3,588 0.505%	\$12,636	17.6	0.351%	\$8,776	\$21,412
Oxford	888	645	435	277	192	163	2,600 0.366%	\$9,157	33	0.658%	\$16,455	\$25,611
Plainfield	794	582	473	349	249	267	2,714 0.382%	\$9,558	42.7	0.852%	\$21,291	\$30,850
Plainville	1109	835	614	487	400	415	3,860 0.544%	\$13,594	9.6	0.191%	\$4,787	\$18,381
Plymouth	738	496	342	268	215	246	2,305 0.325%	\$8,118	22.4	0.447%	\$11,169	\$19,287
Pomfret	232	197	114	84	65	63	755 0.106%	\$2,659	40.6	0.810%	\$20,244	\$22,903
Portland	618	430	319	266	236	214	2,083 0.293%	\$7,336	23.7	0.473%	\$11,817	\$19,153
Preston	318	272	199	137	126	79	1,131 0.159%	\$3,983	31.3	0.624%	\$15,607	\$19,590
Prospect	590	485	301	258	202	179	2,015 0.284%	\$7,097	14.3	0.285%	\$7,130	\$14,227
Putnam	564	380	274	254	228	303	2,003 0.282%	\$7,054	20.1	0.401%	\$10,022	\$17,077
Redding	646	429	274	233	248	359	2,189 0.308%	\$7,709	32.2	0.642%	\$16,056	\$23,765
Ridgefield	1444	1005	761	626	511	479	4,826 0.680%	\$16,996	34.8	0.694%	\$17,352	\$34,349
Rocky Hill	1388	901	652	622	546	772	4,881 0.688%	\$17,190	13.9	0.277%	\$6,931	\$24,121
Roxbury	231	187	101	58	49	38	664 0.094%	\$2,339	27.4	0.546%	\$13,662	\$16,001
Salem	270	193	83	48	39	35	668 0.094%	\$2,353	29.9	0.596%	\$14,909	\$17,261
Salisbury	360	301	223	167	124	198	1,373 0.193%	\$4,836	60.6	1.209%	\$30,217	\$35,052
Scotland	130	94	52	32	22	14	344 0.048%	\$1,212	18.3	0.365%	\$9,125	\$10,336
Seymour	986	651	431	398	375	495	3,336 0.470%	\$11,749	14.7	0.293%	\$7,330	\$19,079
Sharon	249	197	138	123	94	116	917 0.129%	\$3,230	60.3	1.203%	\$30,067	\$33,297
Shelton	2648	2018	1469	1197	1013	1206	9,551 1.345%	\$33,637	31.4	0.626%	\$15,657	\$49,294
Sherman	254	227	151	100	61	68	861 0.121%	\$3,032	23.5	0.469%	\$11,718	\$14,750
Simsbury	1431	977	697	607	484	588	4,784 0.674%	\$16,849	34.5	0.688%	\$17,203	\$34,051
Somers	601	501	334	267	192	179	2,074 0.292%	\$7,304	28.7	0.572%	\$14,311	\$21,615
South Windsor	1490	1107	839	834	593	598	5,461 0.769%	\$19,233	28.5	0.568%	\$14,211	\$33,444
Southbury	1435	1193	837	975	1002	1228	6,670 0.940%	\$23,491	40.9	0.816%	\$20,394	\$43,884
Southington	2919	2344	1572	1313	1122	1092	10,362 1.460%	\$36,493	36.9	0.736%	\$18,399	\$54,893
Sprague	142	117	82	59	44	28	472 0.066%	\$1,662	13.8	0.275%	\$6,881	\$8,543
Stafford	696	467	369	236	255	308	2,331 0.328%	\$8,209	60.8	1.213%	\$30,316	\$38,526
Stamford	6170	4497	3309	2907	2624	2756	22,263 3.136%	\$78,407	39.9	0.796%	\$19,895	\$98,302
Sterling	186	134	69	50	32	20	491 0.069%	\$1,729	27.2	0.543%	\$13,563	\$15,292
Stonington	1379	1064	794	686	612	635	5,170 0.728%	\$18,208	42.7	0.852%	\$21,291	\$39,499
Stratford	3100	2383	1793	1622	1550	1626	12,074 1.701%	\$42,523	18.7	0.373%	\$9,324	\$51,847
Suffield	889	658	419	406	338	393	3,103 0.437%	\$10,928	43.1	0.860%	\$21,491	\$32,419
Thomaston	472	309	240	187	144	167	1,519 0.214%	\$5,350	12	0.239%	\$5,983	\$11,333
Thompson	544	449	313	242	203	173	1,924 0.271%	\$6,776	48.7	0.971%	\$24,283	\$31,059
Tolland	886	656	421	267	196	197	2,623 0.370%	\$9,238	40.4	0.806%	\$20,144	\$29,382
Torrington	2093	1540	1087	1007	961	1265	7,953 1.120%	\$28,009	40	0.798%	\$19,945	\$47,954
Trumbull	1956	1592	1277	1275	1082	1361	8,543 1.203%	\$30,087	23.5	0.469%	\$11,718	\$41,805
Union	73	58	30	26	15	20	222 0.031%	\$782	29.9	0.596%	\$14,909	\$15,691

Appendix A

Municipality	Total Percent						Percent				Total	
	60-64	65-69	70-74	75-79	80-84	over 85	over 60 of Total	Allocation	Sq. Miles	Sq. Miles	Allocation	Apportionment
Vernon	1741	1408	957	805	658	725	6,294 0.887%	\$22,167	18.6	0.371%	\$9,274	\$31,441
Voluntown	152	113	56	54	38	29	442 0.062%	\$1,557	39.7	0.792%	\$19,795	\$21,352
Wallingford	2793	2019	1400	1261	1265	1491	10,229 1.441%	\$36,025	39.8	0.794%	\$19,845	\$55,870
Warren	124	111	61	47	33	23	399 0.056%	\$1,405	28	0.558%	\$13,961	\$15,367
Washington	325	242	174	140	94	85	1,060 0.149%	\$3,733	38.7	0.772%	\$19,297	\$23,030
Waterbury	5233	3880	2838	2512	2101	2612	19,176 2.701%	\$67,535	28.2	0.562%	\$14,061	\$81,596
Waterford	1270	1060	772	710	643	740	5,195 0.732%	\$18,296	36.7	0.732%	\$18,299	\$36,596
Watertown	1509	1082	783	670	544	558	5,146 0.725%	\$18,123	29.8	0.594%	\$14,859	\$32,982
West Hartford	3772	2445	1993	1872	1912	2598	14,592 2.056%	\$51,391	22.2	0.443%	\$11,069	\$62,460
West Haven	3058	2045	1373	1209	1124	1161	9,970 1.405%	\$35,113	10.6	0.211%	\$5,285	\$40,398
Westbrook	522	468	307	235	215	181	1,928 0.272%	\$6,790	16.2	0.323%	\$8,078	\$14,868
Weston	609	443	234	188	148	102	1,724 0.243%	\$6,072	20.8	0.415%	\$10,371	\$16,443
Westport	1576	1296	881	751	670	628	5,802 0.817%	\$20,434	22.4	0.447%	\$11,169	\$31,603
Wethersfield	1672	1326	1097	1066	1019	1001	7,181 1.012%	\$25,290	13	0.259%	\$6,482	\$31,773
Willington	342	246	131	116	87	67	989 0.139%	\$3,483	34.8	0.694%	\$17,352	\$20,835
Wilton	1003	754	501	432	362	441	3,493 0.492%	\$12,302	26.8	0.535%	\$13,363	\$25,665
Winchester	734	510	393	335	276	269	2,517 0.355%	\$8,864	34	0.678%	\$16,953	\$25,818
Windham	1195	847	563	521	469	507	4,102 0.578%	\$14,447	28	0.558%	\$13,961	\$28,408
Windsor	1983	1372	939	749	626	745	6,414 0.904%	\$22,589	31.1	0.620%	\$15,507	\$38,096
Windsor Locks	691	522	430	437	351	346	2,777 0.391%	\$9,780	9.2	0.183%	\$4,587	\$14,368
Wolcott	898	770	573	433	356	408	3,438 0.484%	\$12,108	20.6	0.411%	\$10,272	\$22,380
Woodbridge	648	480	316	284	271	367	2,366 0.333%	\$8,333	19.3	0.385%	\$9,623	\$17,956
Woodbury	811	584	393	283	226	217	2,514 0.354%	\$8,854	36.8	0.734%	\$18,349	\$27,203
Woodstock	523	385	225	188	142	125	1,588 0.224%	\$5,593	61.6	1.229%	\$30,715	\$36,308
							709,854 100.000%	\$2,500,000	5013.8	100.000%	\$2,500,000	\$5,000,000

Appendix B

Coordination

Coordinated transportation systems are an essential element to keeping older adults and people with disabilities independent and actively connected to their communities. A lack of coordinated services leads to confusion, making it difficult for people to navigate the maze of transportation services. Forging partnerships and effectively coordinating resources can result in increased access and improved services. This is evidenced in examples of successful senior transportation models which are grounded in collaboration and include partnerships with the human services network.

Informal Coordination Model

- Voluntary process whereby providers plan their services to not overlap with services provided by other agencies or to fill gaps in service.
- Meetings or other mechanisms where providers share details about their services so that each agency can voluntarily make its program operate consistently or in coordination with the programs of the other agencies.
- Any two or more agencies who voluntarily allow each other's clients to use each other's transportation programs.
- Any agency, which shares its service delivery capabilities with another agency in order to maximize the efficiency or cost effectiveness of both agencies. (Examples could include: agencies pooling their funds to buy vehicles at a better price, sharing the use or maintenance of vehicles, or splitting the duties associated with driver training.)

Formal Coordination Model

- In a lead agency model, one agency takes on the responsibility for providing transportation for several other agencies. The lead agency may be an existing provider of other services or may be solely responsible for transportation services.
- In a brokerage model, the overall management of the system is consolidated, but the fleets are not consolidated. The broker is responsible for setting up a system to provide transportation for several human services programs. Actual operation of the program is dispersed among participating carriers.
- In an administrative agency model, a public agency assumes the responsibility for coordination and provision of transportation. In most cases, the public agency is a regional transportation authority with general responsibility for public transportation in the service area.

Benefits of Coordination

- Offer more rides to more people; serving a greater number of people within current resources.

Appendix B

- Eliminate duplication and inefficiency.
- Avoid or reduce the amount of service cutbacks that might otherwise be necessary.
- Attract new money by demonstrating wise use of scarce resources and responsiveness to community need.

Appendix C

Quarterly Reporting for the Municipal Grant Program

Name of Municipality _____

Date of Submittal _____

Program Year _____

	One-Way Passenger Trips	Vehicle Miles Traveled	Trip Denials	Vehicle Hours	Annual Clients Served	
July 1 - September 30					# of People with Disabilities under 60	
					# of People with Disabilities over 60	
					# of Seniors (over 60) not reported above	
					Total	
October 1 - December 31					# of People with Disabilities under 60	
					# of People with Disabilities over 60	
					# of Seniors (over 60) not reported above	
					Total	
January 1 - March 31					# of People with Disabilities under 60	
					# of People with Disabilities over 60	
					# of Seniors (over 60) not reported above	
					Total	
April 1 - June 30					# of People with Disabilities under 60	
					# of People with Disabilities over 60	
					# of Seniors (over 60) not reported above	
					Total	
Annual Total						

1. A one-way passenger trip should be recorded each time a passenger boards a vehicle.
2. Under the Municipal Grant Program, Senior is defined as 60+ years of age.
3. A client served is an individual who receives transportation service. For example, one client served may generate 10 one-way trips in a week.
4. In the Annual Clients Served column, no person should be reported in more than one category. This column should be cumulative and increase every quarter ONLY by the number of new clients served in the quarter. For example, if 100 clients received transportation services in the first quarter, then 20 additional clients were transported in the second quarter, the second quarter report would have a total of 120.

Appendix B

Connecticut General Statutes 2005

Sec. 13b-38bb. State matching grant program for elderly and disabled demand responsive transportation. Allocations. Requirements. Data collection. (a) Not later than January 1, 2000, then not later than October 1, 2000, and annually after October 1, 2000, the Commissioner of Transportation, within available General Fund appropriations, shall establish a state matching grant program, in accordance with the provisions of this section, which shall be available to any municipality upon application of such municipality. Such grants shall be expended by such municipalities for elderly and disabled demand responsive transportation programs that shall be available to persons age sixty or older.

(b) Not later than thirty days after the commissioner determines an allocation amount, the commissioner shall notify municipalities of the availability of such amount.

(c) Municipalities shall apply to the state through a designated regional planning organization or transit district for funding allocations. The regional planning organization or transit district and municipalities interested in applying for the funds shall collaborate on service design to determine how to use the funding most effectively in that municipality and its surrounding region. The commissioner shall have the authority to approve or disapprove the method for delivery of service.

(d) The maximum amount allocated to a municipality shall be determined by the commissioner in accordance with the following formula: Fifty per cent of such funds shall be apportioned on the basis of the share of the population of persons age sixty or older in the municipality relative to the state's total population of persons age sixty or older, as defined in the most recent federal decennial census or in estimates provided in the five-year interim by the Office of Policy and Management. Fifty per cent of such funds shall be apportioned on the basis of a municipality's square mileage relative to the state's total square mileage.

(e) Each municipality applying for such grant funds shall provide a fifty per cent match to such funds. If a municipality chooses not to apply for such funds, its portion shall revert to the General Fund.

(f) A municipality, receiving a grant provided pursuant to this section, shall annually submit to the Commissioner of Transportation, on forms provided by said commissioner, the following data on such transportation programs: (1) The number of unduplicated riders; (2) the number of one-way trips; (3) the number of miles traveled; (4) the number of trip denials; (5) the number of hours vehicles are in use annually; (6) all federal, state, municipal and other revenues received and expenditures incurred in the provision of dial-a-ride services; and (7) any other information determined to be necessary by the commissioner.

(g) A municipality receiving a grant pursuant to this section shall annually submit to the Commissioner of Transportation a certification that any state grant shall be in addition to current municipality levels of spending on such programs.

(h) Any funds appropriated for the purposes of this section shall not be expended for any other purpose.

(P.A. 99-265, S. 4; P.A. 00-148, S. 22; P.A. 02-123, S. 5.)

History: P.A. 00-148 made technical changes, amended Subsec. (a) by making the state matching grant a program, amended Subsec. (b) by replacing "a grant" with "an allocation", added new Subsec. (c) re application process for allotted funds and redesignated Subsecs. (c) to (g), inclusive, as Subsecs. (d) to (h), inclusive; P.A. 02-123 amended Subsec. (c) to eliminate references to "within the transportation service region, as established in section 13b-38m," and "allocated to municipalities within that transportation service region" and to change "municipality and region" to "municipality and its surrounding region", effective June 7, 2002.